

REMARKS

Receipt of the Office Action of October 6, 2004 is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 11 - 20 are pending and have been examined. Claims 11 - 14 and 19 are rejected, and claims 12 - 18 are objected to because of the dependency of claims 12, 13 and 14 from canceled claim 10 rather than claim 11. Claims have been amended to correct their dependency, thereby overcoming the noted objection.

The examiner has also indicated that claims 15 - 18 and 20 contain allowable subject matter, while rejecting claims 11 - 14 and 19 as anticipated by Lew, 4,807,481 under 35 USC 102(b).

The rejection is respectfully traversed as claim 11 recites a limitation which is not, it is respectfully submitted, found in Lew.

Claim 11 has been amended formally so that it now conforms more closely to canceled claim 1 which it replaced. The examiner will note that claim 11 recites the step of ***producing, using the registered first pressure, p_1 , and the registered second pressure, p_2 , a pressure measurement value that represents an average dynamic pressure acting, averaged over time, at least partly in the flow direction.*** It is respectfully submitted that Lew does not disclose this limitation.

The examiner refers to several portions of Lew but does not refer us to any disclosure in Lew that would, it is respectfully submitted, read on the recited step noted above. Referring to col. 5, lines 42ff, one learns only that the dynamic pressure may be detected by a wing-type vortex sensor. But one also sees that Lew does not disclose or suggest the detecting of dynamic pressure, which acts in the flow direction by means of an insertion-type vortex sensor. See col. 10, line 58 to col. 12, line 18, which refers to Figs 14 and 15. The pressure sensor panel 107 is disposed within cavity 108 which communicates only via pressure transmitting holes 116 and 118, which are symmetrically arranged to each other, with the fluid channel. Therefore, the leading face 102 of the bluff body 109 bulkheads off the sensor panel 107 from dynamic pressure acting in the flow direction so that sensor panel 107 cannot "see" the dynamic pressure. The pressure measurement value which represents an average dynamic pressure is not produced using a registered pressure and a second registered pressure.

U.S. Pat. Appl. 10/648,807


Accordingly, Lew cannot anticipate claim 11 as now presented.

New claims 21 - 24 have been added, of which new claim 21 is in independent form. The limitation noted above is also found in new claim 21 so that it too cannot be anticipated by Lew.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and re-examination are respectfully requested and claims 11 - 24 found allowable.

Respectfully submitted,
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

Date: January 6, 2005



Felix J. D'Ambrosio
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number 25,721

Customer Number ***23364***
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

S:\Producer\fjd\CLIENTS\Endress + Hauser Holding GmbH\KEIT3001 - FL0166\Jan 6 2005 response.wpd

U.S. Pat. Appl. 10/648,807

The Drawings:

Figs 9 and 10 as filed contain the German term "Taktgeber" which is a clock (CLK) as also indicted. A replacement page for each of the noted Figs (pages 12/14 and 13/14) are being submitted herewith for the examiner's approval.